



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** September 8, 2016  
**TO:** Jeremy Schaub, Gabriel Ng + Architects, INC.  
**FROM:** Lisa M Gibson, Planning Department  
**RE:** PPA Case No. 2016-007695PPA for 1420 Hampshire Street &  
2801 26<sup>th</sup> Street

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Julie Moore, at (415) 575-8733 or [Julie.Moore@sfgov.org](mailto:Julie.Moore@sfgov.org), to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa M. Gibson, Acting Environmental Review Officer



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* September 8, 2016  
*Case No.:* **2016-007695PPA**  
*Project Address:* 1420 Hampshire Street & 2801 26<sup>th</sup> Street  
*Block/Lot:* 4334/001  
*Zoning:* RH-2 (Residential House, Two-Family)  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Area Plan:* Eastern Neighborhoods, Mission Area Plan  
*Project Sponsor:* Jeremy Schaub, Gabriel Ng + Architects Inc.  
415-682-8060  
*Staff Contact:* Julie Moore – (415) 575-8733  
[Julie.Moore@sfgov.org](mailto:Julie.Moore@sfgov.org)

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### DISCLAIMERS:

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) letter provides feedback to the project sponsor from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project described in the PPA application submitted on June 9, 2016, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on the PPA application and plans, the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to construct a two-story addition to an existing single-story, 17,280-square-foot (sf) residential care facility with 33 beds located at the corner of Hampshire Street and 26th Street in the Mission neighborhood. The existing building on the 12,159-sf subject lot was constructed in 1968. The proposed new 15,315-sf addition would add 62 beds, a recreation room, restroom facilities and shower facilities on the second and third floors. The proposed addition would raise the building height from

approximately 12.5 feet to approximately 35 feet, excluding elevator and stair penthouses. The proposed project includes a 1,328-sf deck on the third floor facing Hampshire Street and a 745-sf roof. The facility has an existing basement-level parking garage that accommodates ten vehicles and one accessible van, accessed from a driveway on Hampshire Street. A white loading zone is located on the 26th Street side of the building. No changes are proposed to the parking and loading facilities. The project proposes four Class 2 bicycle parking spaces

## BACKGROUND:

The project site is within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans cover the Mission (location of project site), East South of Market (SoMa), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and Central Waterfront neighborhoods. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the *Eastern Neighborhoods Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)* by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.<sup>1,2</sup> The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and its associated rezoning became effective December 19, 2008.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

### *Community Plan Exemption*

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR.

As discussed above, the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it would be eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). Please note that a CPE is a type of exemption from environmental review, and cannot be modified to reflect changes to a project after approval. Proposed increases beyond the CPE project description in project size or intensity after project approval will require reconsideration of environmental impacts and issuance of a new CEQA determination.

Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

- 1. CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, and there would be no new "peculiar" significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this

---

<sup>1</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed August 17, 2012.

outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$14,017) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently \$7,779).

2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$14,017) and (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value).
3. **Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$14,017); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value). An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

Formal environmental review begins with Planning Department review of the **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)** filed by the project sponsor. The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA application or subsequent to issuance of the PPA letter.

The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. **Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.** EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Publications" tab. See "Environmental Applications" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.<sup>3</sup>

A detailed and accurate description of the proposed project is essential for adequate environmental review. Please update the EEA project description as necessary to reflect feedback provided in this PPA letter, and include any additional documents requested herein. Furthermore, please include the following information regarding the proposed project: type of building foundation and whether any stationary

---

<sup>3</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

sources, such as emergency backup generators, are included in the project. If you have already filed your EEA, you may provide the requested information and documents as supplements to your application.

Below is a list of topic areas addressed through the environmental review process. Some of these would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application.

- 1. Historic Resources.** The project proposes alteration of a building located in the South Mission Historic Resources Survey Area. The survey found the property was not located in a historic district, but no individual evaluation was completed because the building was not age-eligible for individual listing at the time the survey was completed. The building is now age-eligible. Therefore, the proposed project is subject to review by the Department's Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The qualified professional must be selected from the Planning Department's Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email ([tina.tam@sfgov.org](mailto:tina.tam@sfgov.org)) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. The selected consultant must scope the HRE in consultation with Department Historic Preservation staff. Please contact the HRE scoping team at [HRE@sfgov.org](mailto:HRE@sfgov.org) to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete HRE is received.
- 2. Archeological Resources.** The project site lies within the Archeological Mitigation Zone J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies of the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*. Therefore, the proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Although the initial information provided indicates that soil excavation is not required, it is possible that construction designs may identify the need for subsurface disturbance such as installation of footings or other foundation materials. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of project

mitigation measures (such as archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. The Street Design Advisory Team has reviewed the proposed site plans and identified that the current curb ramp at the southwest corner of 26<sup>th</sup> and Hampshire does not meet city standards and a second curb ramp or corner bulbout would need to be installed at this location. Refer to the Streetscape and Public Real comments on page 11 for further detail.

On April 28, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution to initiate Planning Code amendments that would require development projects to comply with a proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program. The intent of the proposed TDM Program is to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to make it easier for people to get around by sustainable travel modes such as transit, walking, and biking.

Under the proposed TDM Program, land uses are grouped into four categories, A through D. For each land use category that is subject to the TDM Program, the City would set a target based on the number of accessory vehicle parking spaces that the project intends to provide for that land use category. To meet each target, the project sponsor must select TDM measures—each worth a specified number of points—from a menu of options. In general, if a project sponsor proposes more parking, the target for that land use category—and thus, the number of TDM measures that the sponsor must implement to meet it—would increase. Some of the TDM measures included in the menu are already required by the Planning Code. Points earned from implementing these measures would be applied towards achieving a project's target(s). Project sponsors would be required to implement and maintain TDM measures for the life of the project.

The proposed project includes the addition of 62 beds in a residential care facility, and would thus be subject to the proposed TDM Program. Because there are no new parking spaces associated with the residential care facility expansion, the project would be required to meet or exceed a target of 13 points for land use category B. The Planning Code would currently require the project, as described below in this PPA, to provide the following TDM measure: Bicycle Parking (Planning Code Section [155.2](#); TDM Menu ACTIVE-2). You may be required to select additional TDM measures to meet the targets listed above. A full list of the TDM measures included in the menu of options is available at <http://sf-planning.org/shift-encourage-sustainable-travel>. When an environmental planner is assigned, he or she will update you regarding the proposed TDM Program and next steps.

4. **Noise.** The proposed project could be subject to Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2. *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise* addresses requirements related to the use of pile-driving. If project construction would include pile driving, *Noise Mitigation Measure F-1* would apply to the proposed project. This mitigation measure requires that contractors use equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be

used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.

*Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise* requires that the project sponsor develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant when the environmental review of a development project determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and sensitivity of proximate uses. This mitigation measure requires that a plan for such measures be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project's two-story addition to add 62 beds to the existing residential elder care facility is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6. The proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the Department of Public Health.

In addition, the project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on and modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, no additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are anticipated. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Additional measures, such as that described in *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit Diesel Particulate Matter*, would likely be necessary to reduce its emissions. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

6. **Greenhouse Gases.** *The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's

---

<sup>4</sup> BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011, Chapter 3.

Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.<sup>5</sup> The project sponsor is required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

7. **Wind.** The proposed project would not involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height; therefore, a consultant-prepared wind analysis is not required.
8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would not result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height, as measured in accordance with the Planning Code. Therefore, a consultant-prepared shadow study is not required.
9. **Geology.** The project site is located within the former alluvial floodplain of Precita Creek, which was located approximately 130 feet south of the site. However, the project site does not appear to be located within an area of artificial fill placed in the former creek that has resulted in a Seismic Hazard Zone due to the liquefaction hazards of fill material. Therefore new construction on the site would not be subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.<sup>6</sup> To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a geotechnical study with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.
10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would add additional elderly residents to a residential care facility on a site designated as subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance based on the current Maher Map. It appears, however, that the site may be erroneously listed on the Maher Map due to a mapping error in the underlying California State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker database.<sup>7</sup> If any subsurface excavation would be required, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6 must be submitted with the EEA. The Phase I ESA would assess the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project, which would assist in evaluating whether the project would be subject to Article 22A.

The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH) requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp>. Fees for DPH review and

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

<sup>6</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Interdepartmental Project Review*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=522>.

<sup>7</sup> California State Water Resources Control Board, Geotracker, database search on August 23, 2016. Available at: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=1420+hampshire+st%2C+San+francisco>

oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH's fee schedule, available at: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz>.

Because the project would modify an existing building, *Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials* would be applicable to the proposed project. The mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, and any fluorescent light tubes containing mercury be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. In addition, any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, must be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Because the existing building was constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as roof, floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements related to demolition of buildings with asbestos-containing materials. In addition, because of its age (constructed prior to 1978), lead paint may be found in the existing building. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

11. **Naturally Occurring Asbestos.** The project site is underlain by Pleistocene alluvium. No subsurface materials containing naturally occurring asbestos are anticipated.
12. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any "major project." A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding \$1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occur, the filing requirement shall be triggered by the earliest such determination.) A major project does not include a residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date the Planning Commission (or any other local lead agency) certifies the EIR for that project or, for a major project relying on a program EIR, within 30 days of the date that the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts a final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at <http://www.sfethics.org>.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

The project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed.

1. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required for a residential care facility in a RH-2 District providing lodging, board and care for a period of 24 hours or longer to seven or more persons, pursuant to Planning Code Section 209.1.
2. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Conditional Use Authorization applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

**NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:**

Project Sponsors are encouraged, and in some cases required, to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.

This project is required to conduct a **Pre-Application** meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-Application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Resource Center" tab.

**Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice may be required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and, to the extent feasible, occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review process. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request during the environmental review process.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may substantially impact the proposed project.

1. **Residential Care Facility in RH-2 Zoning District.** A Residential Care Facility for 7 or more persons is a conditional use in the RH-2 Zoning District, pursuant to Planning Code Section 209.1. A Conditional Use Authorization (Case No. 99.406C) for a Residential Care Facility for up to 33 residents was approved by the Planning Commission in 1999. The intensification and enlargement of

a permitted conditional use, such as an increase from 33 to 95 residential beds, requires approval of a new Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 178.

2. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 outlines the requirements for a rear yard within the RH-2 Zoning District. For the RH-2 Zoning District, the minimum rear yard depth shall be equal to 45 percent of the total depth. For corner lots, the required rear yard may be reduced to the depth of the rear building walls of the adjacent building, but not less than 25% of the lot depth or 15 feet, whichever is greater pursuant to Planning Code Section 135(c). The subject lot is 116 feet in depth. As currently proposed, the project does not meet this requirement as the new construction has a rear yard area of 20 feet in depth, which is less than the minimum 25% of the lot depth. Please revise the project and set back the new construction (second and third floors) a minimum of 29 feet from the rear property line.
  - o **Height Restrictions-Rear Yard.** When the rear yard is reduced to less than 45%, pursuant to Planning Code Section 135(c), the last 10 feet of building depth thus permitted is limited to a height of 30 feet. The project will therefore have to reduce the height of the rearmost 10 feet from 34 feet-9 inches to 30 feet.
3. **Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 outlines the requirements for useable open space in the RH-2 Zoning District. A Residential Care Facility is defined as an Institutional Use under Planning Code Section 102 and therefore does not have a minimum requirement for useable open space.

While there is no minimum requirement, the Planning Department recommends that the project provide useable open space equivalent to that required for group housing, as that standard has been used as guidance by the Planning Commission on prior cases. Group housing requires an area per bedroom that is one third the amount required for a dwelling unit in the subject zoning district. The RH-2 Zoning District requires 166 square feet of common open space per dwelling unit; therefore for a project with 48 bedrooms the Planning Department would recommend approximately 2,655 square feet of common open space.

4. **Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 requires a Residential Care Facility to provide one parking space per 10 residents. The project appears to meet and exceed this requirement with the existing eleven vehicle parking spaces.
5. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires a Residential Care Facility to provide two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces for every 50 beds. The project appears to meet this requirement as it proposes four new Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. While Class 1 bicycle parking spaces are not required, the project may want to consider replacing the excess vehicle parking space with Class 1 bicycle parking spaces.
6. **Impact Fees.** This project will be subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the [Planning Director's Bulletin No. 1](#) for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection's [Development Impact Fee webpage](#) for more information about current rates.

Based on an initial review of the proposed project, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:

- a. Transportation Sustainability Fee ( Planning Code Section 411A)
- b. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (Planning Code Section 423)

## PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The following comments address preliminary design issues that may substantially affect the proposed project:

### *Building*

**1. Site Design, Open Space and Massing.** The Planning Department requires that an Historical Resource Evaluation be prepared and recommends that it be submitted prior to site permit submittal. The Planning Department recommends exploring an alternative design to the open space configuration and to consider at-grade to reduce the requirement for elevator access to the roof.

**2. Architecture.** At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. The Planning Department encourages the use of high quality, compatible materials. Material samples should be submitted and detailed on the plans.

The trash receptacles should be screened. The Planning Department requests that depth of windows be detailed on the plans and with less contrast in frames. The Planning Department recommends exploring means of providing more depth and detailing on the 26<sup>th</sup> Street facade.

### *Streetscape and Public Realm*

The Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) provides design review and guidance to private developments working within the City's public right-of-way. SDAT is composed of representatives from the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning) Department of Public Works (SF Public Works), the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).

The 1420 Hampshire Street project came to SDAT on August 1, 2016. Below are the SDAT comments from that meeting.

1. **26<sup>th</sup> and Hampshire Intersection.** The current curb ramp at the southwest corner of 26<sup>th</sup> and Hampshire does not meet city standards. This can be resolved via one of the two alternatives identified below:

**Alternative 1 – Construct curb ramps to meet City standards.** The project sponsor could install a 2<sup>nd</sup> curb ramp at this location oriented perpendicular to Hampshire that provides an accessible path for

pedestrians traveling into to the Hampshire Street crosswalk. Adding the curb ramp may require relocating the existing catch basin.

**Alternative 2 – Construct a corner bulbout at 26<sup>th</sup> and Hampshire.** The project sponsor may consider adding a corner bulbout at the intersection of Hampshire and 26<sup>th</sup> Streets to improve pedestrian safety and create space for the required second pedestrian ramp.

- A standard 6' bulbout at this location should extend into the 26<sup>th</sup> Street ROW.
- Due to the constrained intersection geometry limiting truck turning movements, a 6' bulbout into Hampshire may be infeasible.
- The project sponsor should work with SFMTA to determine the ideal bulbout geometry.

Per guidelines established in the San Francisco Better Streets Plan the tangent of the curb return on a corner bulbout should start a minimum of 5' beyond the property line.

To ensure that bulbouts are sweepable with standard City street sweeper equipment, bulbout curb returns shall conform to SF Public Works' Standard Plan for Curb Bulbs. Please refer to [http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/pedestrian-safety-and-traffic-calming/traffic-calming-overview/curb-extensions/#codes\\_docs](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/pedestrian-safety-and-traffic-calming/traffic-calming-overview/curb-extensions/#codes_docs)

Modification of the curb line will require Sidewalk Legislation; contact Public Works Bureau of Street Use & Mapping (BSM). It is strongly encouraged that a sidewalk legislation package is submitted at the time a Street Improvement Permit application is submitted since the permit will not be approved until the Sidewalk Legislation is approved, which can take a minimum of 6-12 months for approval.

2. **Landscaping, Street Trees and Site Furnishings in the Public Sidewalk.** The project sponsor shall install understory plantings in the sidewalk furnishing zone on both 26<sup>th</sup> and Hampshire Streets. All landscaping, street trees, site furniture, and special paving should be consistent with guidelines in the Better Streets Plan. Please refer to [www.sfbetterstreets.org](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org).

Per SFMTA standards, trees shall not be placed within 25 feet of intersections, to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety.

Any proposed new, removed, or relocated street trees and/or landscaping within the public sidewalk may require a permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Urban Forestry. For additional information visit <http://www.sfdpw.org/trees> or call 415-554-6700.

3. **Electrical Transformer Room.** If an additional electrical power transformer is required by PG&E to provide power to the expanded building, please show the location of the transformer room on the plans. SF Public Works typically does not permit new transformer vaults in the public right-of-way. If an exception is requested, a Vault Permit from SF Public Works BSM will be required.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **March 8, 2018**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

cc: Tommy Lee, Merced Residential Care, Property Owner  
Ella Samonsky, Current Planning  
Julie Moore, Environmental Planning  
Danielle DeRuiter-Williams, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary  
Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA  
Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works  
Pauline Perkins, SFPUC

Planning Department Webmaster ([planning.webmaster@sfgov.org](mailto:planning.webmaster@sfgov.org))